R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 792 AL 001 205

THE UZBEK NATIONAL LANGUAGE. PRELIMINARY TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED WORKS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS, NUMBER III.

BY- RESETOV, V.V.
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE JUL 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *UZBEK, *LANGUAGE RESEARCH, HISTORY, *OFFICIAL LANGUAGES, WRITTEN LANGUAGE, DIACHRONIC LINGUISTICS, DIALECTS, TURKIC LANGUAGES, *CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS, LITERATURE, TAJIK, ARABIC, ETHNIC ORIGINS, LANGUAGE USAGE, VOWEL HARMONY, SUBSTRATA,

THE UZBEKS BELONG TO THOSE TURKIC-SPEAKING PEOPLES WHO HAVE A RICH LITERARY TRADITION. THE STUDY OF THE OLD UZBEK LITERARY LANGUAGE (SOMETIMES REFERRED TO INCORRECTLY AS "CHAGATAY") IS OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE FOR DETERMINING THE PERIOD OF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE UZBEK LITERARY LANGUAGE. IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT FOR ESTABLISHING ITS RELATIONSHIP TO (1) UZBEK DIALECTS, (2) RELATED TURKIC LANGUAGES, PARTICULARLY UIGHUR, AND (3) NON-RELATED LANGUAGES, SUCH AS TAJIK (CENTRAL ASIATIC PERSIAN) AND ARABIC. THE FORMATION OF THE OLD UZBEK LITERARY LANGUAGE DATES BACK TO THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES. A LARGE PART OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY LITERATURE REMAINS UNSTUDIED TO THIS DAY. WHILE THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE OF THIS PERIOD WAS "HIGH STYLE" AND NOT INTELLIGIBLE TO THE BROAD MASSES OF THE PEOPLE, AT ITS BASE LAY A FOLK LANGUAGE HEAVILY INFLUENCED BY LEXICAL BORROWINGS FROM ARABIC AND TAJIK. THE GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE WAS AND STILL IS MORE STABLE, REVEALING A SIGNIFICANT CORRELATION BETWEEN THE CASE FORMS OF OLD UZBEK AND MODERN UZBEK. THE UNUSUAL NATURE OF THE DIALECT MAP OF UZBEK IS BEST EXPLAINED IN TERMS OF THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ETHNO-GENETIC PROCESS UNDER WHICH THE UZBEK NATION WAS FORMED. CERTAIN LOCAL DIALECTS HAVE RETAINED CLEAR TRACES OF LINGUISTIC INTERACTION BETWEEN MEMBERS OF VARIOUS TURKIC TRIBAL GROUPS DURING DIFFERENT PERIODS OF THEIR JOINT EXISTENCE. ALSO A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR IS THE VERY PROLONGED LINGUISTIC CONTACT WITH NON-TURKIC ETHNIC ELEMENTS. RESULTS OF THE INFLUENCE OF THIS SUBSTRATUM ARE CLEARLY APPARENT NOT ONLY IN THE LEXICAL SPHERE BUT ALSO IN PHONETICS, AND TO SOME EXTENT, IN THE GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE OF UZBEK. THIS STUDY, TRANSLATED BY HELEN CHAVCHAVADZE OF CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND EDITED FOR CONTENT BY ANDREE S. SJOBERG OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, APPEARED ORIGINALLY IN "VOPROSY FORMIVORANIJA I RAZVITIJA NACIONAL'NYX JAZYKOV (PROBLEMS OF THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL LANGUAGES," M.M. GUXMAN, EDITOR, MOSCOW, 1960. (AMM)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY the Center for Applied Linguistics TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS
1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

ED018792

PRELIMINARY TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED WORKS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

M.M. GUXMAN (ed.) Voprosy formivoranija i razvitija nacional'nyx jazykov [Problems of the Formation and Development of National Languages], Moscow 1960

Number III

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This project was supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant NSF GS-325. The Center for Applied Linguistics reserves all rights applicable to these translations. Comments are invited and may be addressed to the Translators at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

July 1964

AL 001 205

THE UZBEK NATIONAL LANGUAGE

by V.V. Rešetov

Translated by Helen Chavchavadze

The Uzbeks belong to those Turkic-speaking peoples who have a rich literary tradition. The written works of the Uzbeks cover more than a single century.

The predominance of Arabic literature in the seventh and eighth centuries and the co-existence of Arabic and Central Asiatic Persian (Tadjik) in the literature of the ninth and tenth centuries could not help but be reflected in the formation and development of the old Uzbek written language during the Karkhanid era.

The written works of the eleventh through the fourteenth centuries are especially valuable for both the history of the Uzbek people and the history of their language[1]. At the start of this period "large masses of Turks: Karluk, Yagma, Čigil and others"[2] joined the ranks of the Karkhanids in the territory of present-day Uzbekistan. The Karkhanids were not a monolithic unity either from a linguistic or from an ethnic point of view. They were a conglomeration of Turkic tribes, the most important of which were the Karluk and the Čigil. The latter were in close contact with the population of Fergana during the pre-Mongol era. Members of this tribe played a leading role in Fergana during the eighth century. But within the Karkhanid union, the Uighur also played an important role. The Karluk and the Uighur were the largest and the most powerful tribes; they were the power behind the Karkhanid union around which various Turkic-speaking tribes united.

Under these circumstances a linguistic community was formed which became the basis for the language of the Uzbek people.

Many written works from this period, for instance the "Kutadgu-bilik" ('Wisdom imparting happiness') and the classical works of Makhmud Kašgarskij "Divan-lugat-at-turk" ('A Collection of Turkic languages') which belong to the eleventh century, as well as other works which have come down to us from this period, illuminate the history of the Uzbek people and are especially useful source materials for the study of the history and dialectology of the Uzbek language of an earlier period[3].

AL 001 205

The study of the old Uzbek literary language, incorrectly called "Čagataj"[4], is of the utmost importance for determining the periods of historical development of the Uzbek literary language, and establishing its relationship to Uzbek dialects and to related Turkic languages, above all Uighur, as well as to non-related languages such as Tadjik and Arabic. The formation of the old Uzbek literary language dates back to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The period circa the fifteenth century was characterized by a strong cultural movement among the Uzbeks for the use of the native language for literary purposes. During this period a rich Uzbek literature was created, a large part of which remains unstudied to this day. In defense of the use of his native language in written literature, the world-renowned poet Ališer Navoi showed in his famous work "Mukhakamat-ul-Lugatajn" ('Lawsuit of Two Languages')[5] that the old Uzbek language had all the elements (richness of lexico-grammatical devices and language flexibility) necessary for any literary genre. As its name indicates, this remarkable philological work written by the founder of the old Uzbek literary language thoroughly elucidated the complex process which was taking place within the historical development of two literary languages, "Central Asiatic Persian" (Tadjik) and Turkic (Uzbek). The Uzbek-Tadjik linguistic ties, which had been initiated long before the time of Ališer Navoi, were to undergo further development. These ties were not exclusively a property of the written language.

Turkology does not have at its disposal adequate data on the actual link between the written language and the actual local folk dialects of the period circa the fifteenth century. In the literature specializing in this area, we find only incidental comments or indirect references to this subject; the language of individual poets and prose writers of the period has barely been touched on by researchers.

Data on the sound system of the old Uzbek language can be found in the works of several Turkologists. K.K. Judakhin, who investigated the tuyugi s igroy rifm, s tadžnisom ("tuyug with a play of rhythms, with a pun" [Translator's note: The "tuyug" is an Uzbek verse form, with a four-line stanza.]) came to the conclusion "that the main Čagataj poets were

speakers of local dialects which lacked vowel harmony and in which there were only six vowels."[6] K.K. Judakhin was the first Turkologist to express a definite point of view on this important question, based on an analysis of factual material.

A.K. Borovkov objected to the methods of reconstruction of the vowel system of the old Uzbek language set forth in the above-mentioned article by K.K. Judakhin.[7] However, in analyzing the linguistic facts in order to "determine with some degree of accuracy the phonological system of the language of Ališer Navoi as used in his own speech", A.K. Borovkov arrived at approximately the same conclusion. He thinks the dialect base of Navoi's language can be traced to intermediate local dialects which had essentially lost their vowel harmony but had retained elements of the vocalic distinctions o/ö and u/ü.[8]

As can be seen the investigators are fundamentally in agreement that the language of Navoi belongs to those local Uzbek dialects which lack vowel harmony. Nor does there exist any fundamental disagreement as to the geographical location of this dialect: "...the vowel system of Čagataj," writes K.K. Judakhin, "corresponds exactly to the vowel system of certain local iranized Uzbek dialects (those showing loss of vowel harmony) from the Fergana district where, it seems to me, we must look for the answers to many questions concerning Čagataj."[9] The same idea is expressed by A.K. Borovkov.[10]

These conclusions do not contradict those of Navoi's younger contemporary, Babur, who draws our attention in his prose composition "Babur-name" to the fact that the language of Navoi would seem to reflect the local dialect of Andijan. Babur specifically states this in his remark: "kalam bila rost." V.V. Bartol'd says, "...these words should be understood to mean that in Andijan, a cultured city, they spoke 'correctly'[11] i.e., close to the literary language."

In all probability, the Andijan local dialect, even in the time of Babur, was not strictly harmonic as was also the case with the local dialects of certain other cities of Fergana, for example Margelan,[12] but it did retain contrasting pairs in the series of high and higher-mid rounded vowels, which are still observable today in the Andijan group of Uzbek local dialects. To assume a subsequent increase in the number of vowel phonemes would be difficult in view of the general tendency towards de-harmonization which had already begun many centuries before in the local dialects of the urban variety.

The lexical-semantic features of the language of the literary works of this period have not been adequately defined. Abul'-Gazi, in his work "Šadjarai Tjurk" ('Genealogy of the Ancient Turks') which he wrote in the seventeenth century, mentions the fact that the written language was inaccessible to the broad masses. The author attempted to render the language of his book universally intelligible. In his own words: "I expressed myself in Turkic in such a way that a five year old child would understand; in order to make it clear, I did not mix in a single word from Čagataj-Turkic, from Persian or from Arabic."[13]

All the evaluations of the old Uzbek language available to us are naturally in need of careful study. Nevertheless, it seems to be an indisputable fact that in order to resolve current questions concerning the Uzbek language and to determine the sources from which it was nourished, we must look to the Fergana group of local dialects which played no small role in the history of the written language.

We cannot suppose that the written language of the period circa the fifteenth century, which was set apart by its "high style", was intelligible to the broad masses of the people but we must acknowledge the fact that at its base lay a folk language burdened by the influence of a literary tradition of using foreign words. The lexical borrowings from Arabic and Tadjik were numerous. A significant part of this lexicon was confined to the literary language. The local spoken dialects assimilated only what was absolutely necessary. We find traces of this even in the modern Uzbek language.

The grammatical structure of the language was and still is more stable. An analysis of the case forms of old Uzbek in fifteenth-century written works reveals a significant correlation with the case forms of modern Uzbek. This correlation can be observed not only in the actual case functions but also in their phonological make-up, with the exception of the phonetic variant of the base form ending, -din, which is genetically related to the Uighur written tradition and characteristic of the old Uzbek written language.[14]

The convergence of the genitive case ending (-ning) and the accusative case ending (-ni), observable in the modern Uzbek dialects of the urban type (Tashkent, Fergana, etc.) cannot be considered accidental. Failure to distinguish these affixes has resulted in the occurrence of

only one formant (-ni), which functions in these dialects both as the genitive case ending (bolani kŭli 'child's hand') and the accusative case ending (bolani kŭrdim 'I saw the child'). In this case the investigator is interested not so much in the formal convergence of -ning and -ni into the affix -ni, which is typical of the Uzbek dialects which lie at the base of the modern literary language, both the written and spoken standards, but rather in the historical outlook, the dynamics of the development of these forms. In the old Uzbek written language there are quite a few instances of parallel usage of the genitive and accusative cases. Here we have something in common with the present condition of these case forms in local urban dialects and indications that there were ties between the written language of that time and the local spoken dialects.[15]

It is a well-known fact that in the old Uzbek written language we find frequent occurrences of the convergence of locative (-da) and dative-directional (-ga) as well as locative (-da) and base form (-dan). Confusion of the locative and dative-directional cases is also observable in the modern local dialects of Samarkand and Bukhara where bilingualism is predominant. This phenomenon is usually attributed to the unilateral influence of Tadjik. However other local Uzbek dialects which are also historically linked to Tadjik maintain a strict differentiation between these two cases.

Occurrences of parallel usage of the locative and dative-directional cases in fifteenth century Uzbek indicate that in the local dialects reflected in the written works of Uzbek there existed one case which combined the functions of the above-mentioned cases. We cannot ignore the influence of the substratum which must have been gradually weakening in connection with the constant flow of Turkic tribal groups and subgroupings into the ancient territory of what is now Uzbekistan. This might constitute a satisfactory solution to this problem if there were not instances of the convergence of these cases in Kumyk as well.

From the fifteenth to the twentieth century, certain changes occurred also in the structure of the Uzbek verb. In old Uzbek of the fifteenth century, as during an earlier period of its development, the passive-reflexive forms of the verb with affixes -n and -l were a non-differentiated grammatical category. This is substantiated by a comparison of the use of these forms in written works (Makhmud Kašgarskij's dictionary, the Tafsir, and the works of Navoi, Babur and other writers) with data from the

contemporary language. In the language of these writers of the period circa the fifteenth century, the passive-reflexive verbs were transitive and governed direct objects in the accusative case, occasional traces of which can be seen in modern Uzbek. For example, bu sŭzni kullandi 'this word was used'; ošni eyildi, čoy ičilgani yŭk 'dinner has been eaten but the tea has not yet been drunk'; bu xatni yozildi 'this letter was written', etc. This use of the passive-reflexive voice is neither accidental nor incorrect as some investigators are apt to consider it.[16] The presence of these constructs (the combination of the passive-reflexive voice with a direct object in the accusative) in modern Uzbek is historically conditioned.

The development of the conjugational forms in modern Uzbek deserves mention but they have not been studied at all on the historical level. The modern forms of the momentary present (of the type: kelyapman 'I am coming (at the present moment)' : Tashkent, kevɔtmə́n > kevɔmmən; Namangan, kelutimən; Samarkand, kelɔpman, etc.)[17] are not found in the old Uzbek written works. In this connection, two possible explanations might be mentioned: either these verbal forms, which are standard in modern Uzbek, occurred in the fifteenth century spoken dialects but did not find expression in the written language of that time, or their appearance in the language must be assigned to a later period.

The structure of the old Uzbek language of the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries has not yet been adequately studied. The changes which occurred in the grammatical system at various stages of development have not been uncovered. The most intensive changes took place within the lexicon, but students of the language of that period have not concentrated on exposing the lexical features in their role of replenishing the lexical stock of the language.

While the old Uzbek written language of the fourteenth century and later was to a great extent typified by its isolation from reality and, characterized by its flowery style, its word plays (sanay'i lafziya), its abundance of metaphors, synonyms and homonyms, and its development of a vocabulary at the cost of a written language saturated with foreign words (principally from Arabic and Tadjik), the written language of a later period, particularly from the end of the nineteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century, noticeably departed from this tradition.

This later period is characterized by the activity of an important pleiad of poet-democrats, including Furkat, Mukimi, Zavki and Khamza Khakim-zade Nijazi. In their work, these poet-democrats gradually broke away from the predominant literary tradition and reflected the real world in their works, the longing of the Uzbek people suffering under the dual yoke of bey-feudal despotism and the arbitrary colonial rule of Tsarist officials.

Together with the lexicon typical of the written language of the past, the old morphological forms and clichés, we find a growing tendency to democratize the language and its style. The archaic words and expressions are gradually deleted and replaced with words and expressions existing in the spoken language. The language of the poet-democrats becomes simple and precise when portraying commonplace episodes and descriptions. A perfect example of this style is found in the verses of Mukimi and especially Khamza Khakim-zade Nijazi, whose works are permeated with the spoken language, frequently in their own native Fergana dialect. Thus the poet-democrats, Furkat, Mukimi, Zavki and Khamza Khakim-zade Nijazí, in trying to bring the written language closer to the spoken form, enriched the written language.

The literary language based on the Fergana dialect and consolidated in the works of Furkat, Mukimi, Zavki and Khamza Khakim-zade Nijazi did not attain national recognition until the October Socialist Revolution because before that time the necessary prerequisites did not exist in Turkestan. The cultural and economic isolation of different regions, the universally low economic level and the local character of production in the Emirate and in the Khanates did not facilitate an extension of linguistic ties or the unification of this territory with respect to oral communication; in fact, it led to a still greater conservation of dialect features.

In the periodicals which began to appear in the twentieth century, we find merely a distortion of the language which was under formation in the works of the above-mentioned authors. The newspapers published in the cities (Tashkent, Samarkand, Fergan, etc.) were saturated with dialectisms, choked with Turkish linguistic elements as well as Tatarisms (resulting from the direct participation of the Tatar intelligentsia in the establishment of the Djadid press).[18] Efforts to establish a "universal Turkic language" (lisoni umumi) impeded the correct solution of the problem of the formation

of a unified Uzbek literary language. Unnatural forms and a foreign socio-political terminology were introduced into Uzbek. All of this led to the formation of a specialized jargon which was served up as a literary language. However, circumstances required a re-examination of the question of an Uzbek literary language in order to ascertain which of the many local dialects constituted the sources that nourished it.

The dialect situation in Uzbek is complex and unusual. Individual local dialects retain strongly pronounced phonetic and lexico-grammatical differences and frequently the geographical distribution of the local dialects does not coincide with the linguistic features. This great diversity in the dialectology of Uzbek is attributable to a number of factors.

The unusual nature of the dialect map of Uzbek can best be explained in terms of the complexity of the ethno-genetic process under which the Uzbek nation was formed. Certain local dialects and dialects have retained clear traces of linguistic interaction between members of various Turkic tribal groups during different periods of their joint existence.

The unusual dialect structure of Uzbek is also attributable to its very profonged linguistic contact with non-Turkic ethnic elements. Results of the influence of this substratum are clearly apparent not only in the lexical sphere but also in phonetics and, to some extent, in the grammatical structure of Uzbek. Sound shifts occurring in a typical Turkic vowel system based on a non-Turkic substratum led to the gradual reduction of vowel harmony, and in the urban local dialects to its complete loss as well as to the appearance of sounds alien to the phonetic systems of Turkic languages. The above-mentioned factors participated in the convergence of the front vowel Y and the back vowel u into one phoneme u; the front vowel i and the back vowel ı into one phoneme ъ; the front vowel e and the back vowel o into the phoneme o. As a result, the vowel system of the urban sub-dialects of the Tashkent type became more like the vowel system of Tadjik, not to speak of the Samarkand-Bukhara-Khodjent dialects which, being bilingual, reiterate the vowel system of Tadjik. Here we cannot speak of similarity but rather of almost complete "identity."[19] In this connection, E.D. Polivanov established the categories of "iranized" and "non-iranized" dialects with a number of transitional subtypes, thereby taking into consideration the foreign substratum underlying the formation of the local urban dialects of Uzbek.[20]

If we study the complex dialect system of Uzbek on a comparative-historcal plane, it is no problem to establish a precise number of lexico-grammatical and phonetic features which are common to various Uzbek local dialects and dialects and to Turkic dialects territorially adjacent to them. In some cases the historical-linguistic facts make it possible to draw conclusions as to the ethnic relationship between a certain section of Uzbeks and Karakalpaks, Uzbeks and Uighurs, Uzbeks and Turkmen, while in other cases one can only speak of genealogical relations or of a genetic linguistic relationship, i.e., ties of a common linguistic nature, not anthropological or ethnic blood kinship. This circumstance, i.e., the existence of common linguistic features between Uzbek and territorially adjacent languages, occasioned several investigators to divide the Uzbek local dialects into "Turkmenicized", "Kazakhicized" and "Uighuricized" dialects. But the common linguistic elements must not be considered the result of any recent development, i.e., the result of any comparatively late influence by the above-mentioned languages on certain Uzbek local dialects and dialects. Such an interpretation would be completely inaccurate. The historical conditions under which these Uzbek local dialects and dialects gradually formed convince us of this fact.

The existence of blood ties between separate tribal groups who later entered into more powerful groupings, the constant migrations over the territory of Central Asia and Kazakhstan predetermined the complex ethno-linguistic development and the appearance of dialect diversity within certain nationalities, primarily among the Uzbeks. Here we find the interlacing of linguistic ties not only among various Turkic tribal groups (which have left, as the result of mixing, a distinctive Turkic component in the Uzbek system of dialects) but also between Turkic tribal groups and foreign elements, which led to the emergence of special dialect groups in Uzbek not to be found in other Turkic languages.

If we present schematically and in chronological order the penetration of what is now Uzbekistan by Turkic-speaking groups, we will obtain the following outline, which is of course very general.

The very earliest arrivals were the ancient Turkic tribes mentioned by second-century B.C. Chinese chroniclers by the name of Kangjuj whom investigators now assume to be the Turkic tribe, Kangly. The subsequent arrival of the Karluk in the eighth century, the great expansion of the

Kypčak and the Oguz in the tenth century, and the great wave of Turkic-speaking reinforcements during the Karkhanid era (eleventh century) brought about a fundamental change in the correlation of Turkic and non-Turkic ethnic elements which subsequently led to changes in the character of their linguistic ties.

The last important item in the dialect structure of Uzbek was the Uzbek language of the period of Abul-khajra and Šejbani (sixteenth century). This reinforcement was of great significance in the formation of a linguistic community which subsequently became the basis for the Uzbek national language.

The Uzbek national union which formed as a result of a consolidation of the Turkic tribal groups that had been settling the territory of present-day Uzbekistan for an extended period of time, includes three components from a linguistic point of view:

1) the south-eastern component, to which belong the great majority of the Uzbek urban dialects, the so-called "karluk" dialects, and the modern literary and old Uzbek written languages;[21]

2) the south-western component, the Oguz dialect of Uzbek;

3) the north-western component, the Kypčak dialect of Uzbek which consists of numerous so-called "j" sub-dialects.

Thus the basic (Turkic) ingredient in modern Uzbek was the result of a unification of three genetically different Turkic linguistic communities - Kypčak, Oguz and Karluk-Čigil-Uighur. Each of these continues to retain its own characteristic linguistic features which is the basis for separating them into special dialect units when Uzbek is classified as to dialects.

The process of development of the Uzbek literary language and its dialects cannot be fully understood unless the Uzbek-Tadjik ethnic and linguistic ties are taken into consideration. The many-centuried co-existence of the Uzbek and Tadjik linguistic communities led to considerable interaction between these languages. Evidence of this is especially apparent in the lexicon and in the phonological system of the Uzbek language. Many words borrowed from Tadjik make up an integral part of the Uzbek lexicon. The gradual (and sequential) disappearance of vowel harmony, which was the result of the qualitative merging of contrasting pairs of typically Turkic vowels and the appearance in this connection of non-distinctive sounds, came about as the result of the Tadjik influence already mentioned. This process, i.e., an articulatory shift towards the front, was observed by

Makhmud Kashgarskij among the Turkic tribes who visited the cities and were therefore in close contact with the non-Turkic population.

The long interaction between the Uzbek and the Tadjik linguistic systems took different forms at different periods - the gradual assimilation of specific elements by one linguistic community from another; the emergence of bilingualism (dialects of the Samarkand-Bukhara type are an example of such today; and, finally, the prevalence of one of the linguistic communities. However, none of this led to the formation of a new language, different from both Uzbek and Tadjik, as was assumed by certain investigators (who referred in pre-revolutionary historical-linguistic literature to "sart tili" (the "sart" language), from the word "sart", a term which was subsequently considered offensive).[22]

The Arabic language also left its mark on the lexicon of Uzbek as a result of the protracted Arab rule in Maverannakhra and the spread of Islam. But Arabic did not influence the phonetic system of Uzbek. Uzbek did not assimilate Arabic sounds but preserved its own specific linguistic features and subjected the Arabic words to its own pronunciation norms. The percentage of Arabic words borrowed by Uzbek greatly exceeds the percentage of lexical borrowings from Tadjik.[23]

The Uzbek-Tadjik and the Uzbek-Arabic linguistic ties were deeply imprinted on both the spoken language and, especially, on the written literary tradition. To a great extent this was the result of the long domination of Arabic and Tadjik as the literary languages of Central Asia. However these factors did not destroy the Turkic linguistic base which can be traced in works in the written language at various periods of its development.

The historical-linguistic data indicate that the origins of the leading dialect must be sought in the period between the ninth and the fourteenth centuries.[24] Certainly the most important is the Karkhanid movement of the eleventh century, to which is connected the great influx of different Turkic tribes and related sub-groups. The accumulation of Turkic-speaking groups and their consolidation led to a change in the ratio of Turkic and non-Turkic speaking elements in Maverannakhra, which in turn pre-determined later a more complex linguistic interaction.

Under the Karkhanids cities began to develop - cities sprang up where the Turkic tribes settled and in them various kinds of handicrafts were

developed. In the cities a lively trade, for that time, was carried on with the rural population. Trade with the Steppe nomads, who provided the cities with animal products, was no less lively.

All of this led to an extension of the linguistic community and to the formation of elements of city speech, which had to a certain degree absorbed the linguistic features of different Turkic tribal groups, for example, the Oguz, Kypčak, members of which had settled in the cities. It is here that we must look for the rudiments of that Turkic speech which was a means of spoken communication not only within the cities but also with representatives of the nomadic steppe. This process of extending the linguistic ties between the city, on the one hand, and the rural population and the nomadic steppe, on the other, was very successfully described by Makhmud Kašgarskij.

Under these conditions a basic Turkic component of the linguistic community was formed which later became the basis of the language of the Uzbek people. Because this linguistic community was the result of complex interaction between genetically related Turkic tribes and non-Turkic ethnic elements (above all Sogdian and Tadjik), it reflected some linguistic features of the aboriginal population. Contact with the Mongol tribes led to a slight increase in the Mongoloid features in the anthropological type and to the assimilation of a small number of Mongolian lexical elements into Uzbek. These settled Mongol tribes (Barlas, Džalair and others) were completely assimilated within a short time.

Thus it was the Turkic linguistic community, whose base was forming during the Karkhanid period and which has come down to us in modified form, that was undoubtedly the language of wider communication.

The specific ethno-genetic process, the linguistic interaction between related and non-related languages which took place on the territory of present-day Uzbekistan throughout the entire history of the Uzbek people, all led to the formation of a complex system of dialects in Uzbek.

Historically three linguistic communities, which existed on the territory of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, participated in the formation of the language of the Uzbek people: 1) Kypčak, 2) Oguz and 3) Karluk-Čigil-Uighur. Their existence is attested to by the historical-linguistic data on the interaction of Turkic tribal groups. These dialect communities left correspondingly three dialects within the Uzbek language - the Kypčak, the Oguz and the Karluk-Čigil-Uighur which continue to exist at the present time as special dialect entities.

I. The Kypčak dialect group has a number of characteristic features, the most important of which are:

1. Phonetic features:

a) occurrence of contrasting pairs of vowels (u ~ Y, o ~ ɵ, ɨ ~ i, a ~ ə); connected with this, retention of vowel harmony, i.e., alternation of vowels in stems and affixes, characteristic of modern Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kirghiz and other Turkic languages of the Kypčak group;

b) diphthongization of initial vowels of the higher-mid series ($i_{ə}$, u_{o}, $Y_{ɵ}$);

c) diphthong -iy in the words iyt 'dog', biyt 'louse';

d) absence of contrast between long and short vowels; in these local dialects length occurs but only as a conditioned factor, occurring predictably as the result of dropping of adjacent consonant sounds;

e) shift of initial y > ǰ, i.e., here we have the so-called ǰ-pronouncing dialects and not y-pronouncing: ǰol < yol 'road', ǰaman < yaman 'bad' (literary-orthographie ëmon);

f) ġ > v: taġ > tav 'mountain', aġɨz > avuz 'mouth';

g) ġ > y, g > y: yɨgɨn > ǰiyin 'collection', tegdi > tiydi 'he touched', sigir > ciyir 'cow';

h) voicing of p, k, ḱ in intervocalic position: ḱap - ḱabi 'bag' - 'his bag', ek - egip 'sow' - 'having sown', čɨḱ - čɨgɨp 'go out' - 'going out';

i) dropping of final k and ḱ: sarɨḱ>sarɨ 'yellow', kičik/kiči 'small';

j) occurrence of initial h: ayvan>hayvan 'terrace'.

2. Morphological features:

a) alternation of -n(-d)-t in affixes of the genitive (-nɨng/-ning, -dɨng/-ding, -tɨng/-ting) and accusative (-nɨ/-ni, -dɨ/-di, -tɨ/-ti) cases;

b) construction of the dative case formed from personal pronouns of the type: maġan, saġan, uġan;

c) momentary present in -ǰatɨr: baraǰatir 'he is going';

d) present-future participle in -tɨgan: kelətɨgan 'arriving' (kazakh: keletin).

The kypčak dialect group of Uzbek includes members of various Turkic tribal groups. Among them we find the Kypčak, Najman, Ming, Djuz (Juz), Kyrk, Djalair, Keneges, Kongrat, Katagan, Kanli, Mitan, Lakaj, Ujmun,

Karakalpak, tama, Kyšlyk, Ongut, Kyjat, Dorman, Argyn, Uighur, Mongul and many others.

The geographical distribution of these Kypčak local dialects is very extensive. It suffices to say that there is not a single oblast in Uzbekistan where we cannot find speakers of this dialect group. In Tashkent Oblast they have settled along the Angren river valley; in Mirzačula, in Samarkand, Bukhara, Kaškadar'in, Surkhandar'in and Khorezm Oblasts speakers of this dialect make up a large percent of the population; they can also be found in other oblasts, for example, in Fergana and Namangan Oblasts.

The Kypčak local dialects can also be heard in Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, and Tadjikistan. Outside the Soviet Union we find them in the northern part of Afghanistan where the Katagan tribe from around Tashkent resettled.

The Kypčak local dialects are of considerable interest not only to the dialectologist but also to the student of folklore. The rich oral folk literature, especially the heroic epic poem, which is handed down from generation to generation, is the object of great national pride among the Uzbek people. The study of the life and literary creations of the Uzbek storytellers, the great majority of whom are Kypčaks, requires a thorough study of the characteristic linguistic features of this dialect inasmuch as it differs greatly from the standard literary language both on the phonetic and on the lexico-grammatical levels.

II. The Oguz dialect group embraces a large number of different sub-dialects. The most significant features distinguishing this dialect are:

a) occurrence of contrasting pairs of vowels as in the Kypčak local dialects;

b) distinction between short and long vowels, i.e., retention of the Old Turkic feature of length which is present, for example in Turkmen, compare: at 'horse' - a:d 'name'; ot 'grass' - o:t 'fire';

c) voicing of initial t and k: dil 'tongue', g'el 'come here!';

d) strong palatalization of the velar stops: k - k', g - g';

e) genitive affix -ıng/-ing;

f) dative-directional affix -a/-e;

g) loss of initial b in the verb bol>ol 'to be', and many other phonetic and lexico-grammatical features.

III. The Karluk-Čigil-Uighur dialect group includes the urban sub-dialects and sub-dialects from rural areas adjacent to the cities. The formation of this dialect unit was closely associated with the Karkhanid movement of the eleventh century.[25]

The following sub-dialects historically belong to the Karluk-Čigil-Uighur linguistic community: the Namangan, Tashkent, Andižan and other sub-dialects spoken in heavily populated centers in different regions of Uzbekistan. The genetic linguistic relationship among these dialects can be seen both in the phonology, in certain grammatical forms and in the lexicon. The Namangan sub-dialect and more specifically several Kišlač sub-dialects from the Namangan Oblast, are distinguished by the occurrence of a number of typical Uighur features, particularly the "umlaut".[26] Undoubtedly the area of sub-dialects now characterized by the occurrence of the "umlaut" was once considerably larger.

The origin of the Andižan sub-dialect remains a mystery unless we assume that it is based on the same Turkic speech which underlies the sub-dialects of Namangan Oblast. The origin of certain phonetic features and morphological forms occurring in the Tashkent sub-dialect cannot be explained unless we recognize that it is genetically tied to the above-mentioned sub-dialects, since common linguistic phenomena could not have arisen independently in one area and within one linguistic group.

The sub-dialects of this group (Tashkent, Namangan, Andižan, Gergana and the sub-dialects of a number of other population centers) make up a single dialect complex. A number of specific features testify to this fact. A few of them are presented below:

1) alternation of t/č: Tashk., Marg., And., Namang. tъš/čъš 'tooth'; Tashk. č(ъ)šlə/Uigh. (Kashg.) č(ъ)šlə 'teeth'; Tashk. tɣšte > čɣšte/Uigh. čɣštъ 'he left';

2) preservation of final k̇ - k/ġ - g in stems and affixes, compare, for example: Uigh. tə rъġ/tərъk̇ 'millet', sərъġ 'yellow', uruġ 'clan' ačъk̇ 'open'; Tashk. k̇attъġ 'hard', tarɔġ 'comb', ortɔġ 'comrade', k̇ъšlɔk̇lъk̇ ~ k̇ъšlɔġlъġ > k̇ъšlɔ:lъġ 'rural'; Namang. yok̇/yoġ 'no', terъġ 'alive', bθlək 'other', bъr kɣllɣg 'one-day, daily', belъg 'fish'. In pronouns: Uigh., Tashk. k̇andaġ/k̇andak̇ 'how', 'which', andaġ/andak̇, šundaġ/šundak̇, bundak̇/bundaġ 'so' 'such'.

We find final ġ preserved in the documents in old Turkic writing - in the Orkhon inscriptions, in the "Kutadgu bilik", and in the "Divan" by Makhmud Kašgarskij. As regards the devoicing of ġ in this position and its shift to k̇, it has been proposed that this phonetic feature, i.e., ġ>k̇, might have belonged to one of the old dialects and that it is possible that it was a typical phonetic feature of the Karluk dialect;

3) alternation of k̇/x in various positions: Uigh., Tashk., Namang. tok̇ta/toxta 'stop!', tok̇san/toxsan 'ninety', bak̇tuk/baxtuk 'we looked';

4) alternation of l/n: Uigh. kəynək/kənnək/kəllək/kənglək/Tashk. koynək/koylək 'shirt';

5) total progressive assimilation: for example, in the accusative case of nouns - Tashk. tuzzꝑ<tuznꝑ 'salt', ɔšš <ɔšn 'pilaf', temꝑrrꝑ< temꝑrnꝑ 'iron'; Namang. kuššꝑ<kušnꝑ 'bird', gəppꝑ<gəpnꝑ 'conversation', tɔššꝑ<tɔšnꝑ 'stone';

6) the most distinctive phonetic feature of the Uighur language is the so-called "umlaut", i.e., the low vowels a/ə in the first syllable change to the vowel sound e when conditioned by a high narrow vowel ꝑ in the second syllable. Compare, for example, at 'horse', etꝑ 'his horse'. This specific feature of Uighur is found in the sub-dialects of Namangan Oblast but it is absent in the Tashkent and Margelan dialects;

7) the Namangan sub-dialect (like the Uighur language) is characterized by phonetic loss and reduced forms, which are also found in the Tashkent dialect but to a lesser extent. Compare, for example: Tashk., Namang. ɔdəmlə 'people', keldꝑlə 'they came', ḫꝑzə>bzə 'we', sꝑlə>slə 'you'; Tashk. bɔruvdꝑm>bɔru:dꝑm<bɔrꝑp edꝑm; Namang. bɔru:dꝑm 'I walked (just now)';

8) all of these sub-dialects - Tashkent, Namangan, Andižan, Margelan, and Kokand - have within their noun inflection one genitive-accusative case with the affix -nꝑ (and its allomorphs), which combines the functions of the genitive and the accusative cases.[27] These dialects can be further divided into two subgroups according to the allomorphs of this genitive-accusative case affix:

A. Sub-dialects, which permit total progressive assimilation of the first consonant of the affix -nꝑ to the final consonant of the stem (except, of course, for stems ending in a vowel, in which case the affix remains -nꝑ). Here we have the Tashkent and Namangan sub-dialects as well as rural sub-dialects spoken in adjoining areas. For example: Tashk. tuzzꝑ<tuznꝑ 'salt', tɔmmꝑ<tɔmnꝑ 'roof', gəppꝑ<gəpnꝑ 'conversation'; Namang. ɔttꝑ<ɔtnꝑ 'horse', tɔllꝑ<tɔlnꝑ 'willow'. Compare, acc. case: Tashk., Namang., ɔttꝑ sɔttꝑ 'he sold the horse'; gen. case: ɔttꝑ bɔšꝑ 'the horse's head'.

B. The sub-dialects characterized by alternation of -n/-d/-t in the genitive-accusative case affix, conditioned by the final consonant of the stem. To this group belongs the Andižan-Margelan-Kokand subgroup which is

connected with the Kypčak dialects of Uzbek by the occurrence of this feature (alternation of affixed -n/-d/-t). Compare, for example, And., Marg., Kok. otəsʔnʔ kordʔ 'he saw his father', oštʔ məzəsʔ 'taste of the pilaf', toldʔ kestʔ 'he cut down the willow';

9) the group of dialects under consideration has two morphological markers for the momentary present tense:

a) the formant -vot and its phonetic variants: -vət, -ut, -vat - this is the Tashkent form of the affix and is also found in sub-dialects spoken in neighboring villages, for example, in Parkent, etc. Compare - vot - in the Tagab sub-dialect; -vət in the Ujčin and -ut in the Namangan.

Tashkent paradigm

Singular

1p	borvotmən > borvommən	'I am going' (at the present moment)
2p	borvotsən > borvossən	
3p	borvott'ʔ	

Plural

1p	borvotmʔz> borvommʔz	'we are going' (at the present moment)
2p	borvotsʔz> borvossʔz	
3p	borvottʔlə	

Namangan paradigm

Singular

1p	k'ʔluttʔmən	'I am doing' (at the present moment)
2p	k'ʔluttʔsən > k'ʔlussən	
3p	k'ʔlutt'ʔ	

Plural

1p	k'ʔluttʔmʔz	'we are doing' (at the present moment)
2p	k'ʔluttʔsʔz > k'ʔlussʔlə	
3p	k'ʔluttʔ	

Uighur paradigm

Singular

1p	k'ʔlʔvatʔmən	'I am doing' (at the present moment)
2p	k'ʔl'ʔvatʔsən	
3p	k'ʔl'ʔvatʔdu	

Plural

1p	k'ʔlʔvatʔmʔz	'we are doing' (at the present moment)
2p	k'ʔlʔvatʔsʔz	
3p	k'ʔlʔvatʔdu	

The genetic unity of these forms is completely obvious.[28] The Tashkent and Namangan forms represent a further phonetic development of the form kʲlʲvatʲmən. We are convinced of this by the transitional variants which exist in various sub-dialects of Tashkent and Namangan Oblasts. For example, in the Parkent sub-dialect of Tashkent Oblast, we find kʲlvɔttʲm and kʲlvɔttʲmən, which occur on an equal basis and with the same meaning.[29]

The Namangan formant -ut can be traced back to the affix -vat, which has been modified as a result of the phonetic laws operating in this sub-dialect. The process of evolution went like this: -vat > vot > -ot > -ut; proof of this can be found in the transitional phonetic variant kʲlottʲ, which exists in the Namangan dialect along with kʲluttʲ as a phonetic variation.

The development of the affix -vat followed not only the formula -vat > -vot > -ot > -ut, as in the Namangan dialect, or the formula -vat > -vot > -vɔt, as in the Tashkent dialect and in the dialect spoken by the Kišlak who are territorially adjacent to Tashkent, but also the formula -vat > -vət, which has been noted in the Ujčin sub-dialect of Namangan Oblast, and is attributed to the effect of the umlaut which can be traced to the Namangan sub-dialects and to some extent to the other sub-dialects of this dialect complex of Uzbek, as previously stated;

b) the formant -yəp is characteristic of all other urban sub-dialects in the Fergana valley - Andižan, Margelan, Kokand, etc.

	Singular	
1p	kʲlyəpmən > kʲlyəppən	'I am doing' (at the present moment)
2p	kʲlyəpsən	
3p	kʲlyəptʲ	
	Plural	
1p	kʲlyəpmʲz > kʲlyəppʲs	'we are doing' (at the present moment)
2p	kʲlyəpsʲz	
3p	kʲlyəptʲ	

The Samarkand form of this affix -ɔp which can be traced back to the formant -yap, also belongs to the Fergana paradigm (excepting, of course, the Namangan sub-dialect).

		Singular 'I am doing' (at the present moment)
1p	kʻɓlɔpman	
2p	kʻɓlɔpsan	
3p	kʻɓlɔptu	
		Plural 'we are doing' (at the present moment)
1p	kʻɓlɔpmɓz	
2p	kʻɓlɔpsɓz	
3p	kʻɓlɔptu	

The phoneme ɔ in the Samarkand affix -ɔp is very stable, whereas the affixed vowel a in the Tashkent affix -vɔt and the a in the Fergana -yəp have a wide range from sub-dialect to sub-dialect. The vowel a in the affix -vat can be almost completely front (compare Ujčin -vət) and the front vowel ə in Fergana -yəp varies a great deal between ə and a, especially in the native form: kelə yatɓr - kelə yətɓr - kelə yɔtɓr 'he is going' (at the present moment). We find the same phenomenon in the Kypčak sub-dialects: kelə ǰatɨr - kelə ǰətɨr - kelə ǰɔtɨr (kelə yatɨr - kelə yətɨr - kelə yɔtɨr).

The stability of the Samarkand phoneme ɔ in the affix -ɔp can be attributed to the presence of a linguistic element from Tadjik which was dominant continues to be dominant in the structure of this sub-dialect. The distribution of ə < a > ɔ is different in the other sub-dialects of Uzbek.

It would be possible to continue to enumerate the different features of the urban sub-dialects and to describe the dialect features of each sub-dialect individually since every one of them, despite the occurrence of genetic features in common, has its own dialectisms, which make it possible to trace the historical formation and development of each sub-dialect. The historical aspect of the study helps to reveal the history of certain currently productive dialectisms.

We draw your attention to the Tashkent form of the first person, past definite tense -dɓmɓz (-dumuz) which replaces the literary-orthographic form -dik, which occurs in a number of written documents. Tashkent oldɓmɓz/ literary-orthographic oldik 'we took', berdɓmɓz/berdik 'we gave', ʒčtɓmɓz/ičdik 'we drank' (compare Tashkent variants: keldu:, ɔldu:, ʒčtu: - with the phonetically long vowel of the secondary formation in final position, or: kelduzə, ɔlduzə, bɔrduzə, ʒčtuzə). From the etymological standpoint the

Tashkent form in -dʒmɨz is older than the form in -dɨk found in the modern Uzbek literary language. We find it in the "Papers in Honor of Kjul'-Tegina": sözläšdimiz 'we conversed', birtimiz 'we gave', itdimiz 'we did', konurtɨmɨz 'we settled', in the "Divan" by Makhmud Kašgarskij, in the works of Ibn-Mukhanna, in the "Šejbani-name" by Mukhammad Salikh. The origin of this form must be sought in the Karkhanid linguistic tradition.

A graphic representation of the dialect structure of Uzbek and its linguistic ties with neighboring related and non-related languages is presented in the following chart, in very general terms:

	Tadjik language		Uighur language
	1. Karluk-Čigil-Uighur dialect		
Kazakh and Karakalpak languages	2. Kypčak dialect	3. Oguz dialect	Turkmen language

The three dialects shown on the chart (1, 2 and 3) represent the Uzbek language, which took shape as the result of the union of three Turkic components:

1) the Karluk-Čigil-Uighur component, which is closely related to the modern Uighur language and has close ethno-linguistic ties with the Tadjik language;

2) the Kypčak component which is closely related to the Kazakh and Karakalpak languages, and

3) the Oguz component which is closely related to the Turkmen language.

* * * *

The question of the dialect base of the Uzbek literary language has been the subject of heated discussion since the victory of the great October socialist revolution. From time to time, extremely reactionary tendencies have been evidenced in the resolution of this problem. Members of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia with conservative views have tried to make the language of the fourteenth and fifteenth century written documents the basis of the Uzbek literary language, hoping by this method to

prove that the language of these documents is the common literary language of all Turkic-speaking peoples in Turkestan. A few "reformers" have proposed the Kypčak (j-pronouncing) sub-dialects as the basis for the Uzbek literary language, on the grounds that these sub-dialects are the most numerous. They have insisted on establishing linguistic autonomy for speakers of the Kypčak dialect of Uzbek.

On the other hand, the proposition was made to allow the parallel existence of written languages based on all of the Uzbek dialects so that at some future time one of them, which had developed successfully, could ultimately become the universal Uzbek language.

To please the supporters of vowel harmony the Uzbek literary language existed for a long time based on vowel harmony (with a nine phoneme vowel system); this excluded the urban sub-dialects, which have only six or seven vowel phonemes, from participating in the formation of the Uzbek literary language. Thus the dominant linguistic link, which had developed historically and which became the determining one in our times, was ignored. However, attempts to direct the Uzbek literary language down a false path of development did not meet with success. The dialect base of this language is the Tashkent-Fergana group of urban sub-dialects, which can be traced back to the linguistic community of the Karkhanid period and which, by line of linguistic succession, is genetically related to the Uighur language. Together they form one line of development (of this we are convinced by the linguistic data and also by the latest anthropological research). On the historical plane, the dialect base is the Karluk-Čigil-Uighur linguistic community which has assimilated some Oguz and Kypčak elements. The orthoepic norms of the Uzbek literary language correspond basically with the phonetic features of the Tashkent sub-dialect, whereas the morphology is for the most part from Fergana.

As far as the Samarkand-Bukhara-Khodžent group of dialects is concerned, they are of interest only in regard to research on the processes of interaction between two fundamentally different linguistic systems. They have no real significance either on the historical plane, or in the matter of determining the dialect on which the modern Uzbek literary language is based. Even the most superficial comparison of the phonetic norms and morphological forms of the Samarkand sub-dialect, for instance, with the orthoepic norms and the system of morphological forms of the

Uzbek literary language is sufficient to convince one of the correctness of this conclusion.

A few grammatical forms from other Uzbek dialects also entered the literary language, for example, the affix -ǰak (Oguz-Khorezm) and the affix -yotir/ǰatir (Kypčak). Use of these forms was decreed in 1928.

Such is the general description of the historical process of formation of the Uzbek national language based on the ethno-genesis of the Uzbek people.

[FOOTNOTES]

---

1. A.K. Borovkov. Materials for a history of the Uzbek language. "Tjurkologičeskij sbornik", v. 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1951, pp. 73-79.
2. A.J. Jakubovskij. A historical study of the Mongols of the XI-XIII centuries. Coll. "Očerki po istorii russkogo vostokovedenija", Moscow, 1953, p. 76.
3. However these valuable documents, especially the "Divan" by Makhmud Kašgarskij have not been sufficiently researched and studied from the standpoint of historical lexicology and historical grammar. See S. Mutalibov. XI asr ëzma ëdgarliklarida fe"l kategorijasi. Toškent, 1955. See A.K. Borovkov. Essays on the history of the Uzbek language. (Description of the language of the Khikmat by Akhmad Jasevi). - "Sovetskoe vostokovedenie", v. 5, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948.
4. The term "Čagataj" cannot be applied to the Uzbek language, in spite of its conditional use here. Neither the Mongol culture, nor the Mongol language of the period of Genghis Khan and his descendants left any significant trace on the culture and language of the population of Maverannakhra. In our opinion there is insufficient evidence to give the name of the Mongol dynasty to a language which existed long before that dynasty came to Maverannakhra. Such an identification would provide a formal basis for considering Mongolia to be the homeland of the modern Uzbeks and the Mongols, who appeared on the territory of present-day Uzbekistan with the Čagataj dynasty, their ancestors, all of which is fundamentally incorrect and contrary to historical facts. But despite its obvious inappropriateness, the term "Čagataj" has been widely used both for the old Uzbek language of the XII-XIII centuries and later for the modern language (Compare H. Vambery. Čagataische Sprachstudien. Leipzig, 1867, pp. 1-5) which in its turn has led to labelling as Čagataj those urban Uzbek sub-dialects, which have lost their vowel harmony. The people themselves did not call their language Čagataj. Abul' Gazi was not referring to living popular sub-dialects of the Uzbek language when he mentioned "Čagataj turks" (see Histoire des Mogols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghazi Béhadour khan, publiée, traduite

et annotée par le Baron Desmaisons, v. 1 Texte. St.-Pb., 1871, p. 37; v. 2 Traduction, St.-Pb., 1874, p. 36. See also: "Genealogy of the Ancient Turks. Paper by Abul'-Gazi, Khiva khan". Translation and introduction by G.S. Sablukov. Kazan', 1906 (1914), p. 33). Mukhammed Salikh did not identify the terms "Čagataj" and "Uzbek" either (see Mukhammed Salikh. "Šejbani-name". Pub. P.M. Melioranskij. St.Pb., 1908, pp. 75, 211). From the 18 Mongol tribal designations known to us on the territory of Uzbekistan (data from the 1926 census) only one clan bore the collective name of "Čagataj", and it apparently consisted of fragments of different clans. And when in place of the aggressive military-feudal dynasty of the Čagataj the politically independent regime of Timur arose, many writers and poets - Sakkiki, Atai, Lutfi, and later even Navoi - writing in the old Uzbek language, called their native language not "Čagataj" but "Tjurkí".

5. Ališer Navoi. Mukhakamat-ul-Lugatajn. Toškent, 1940. (in the Latinized Uzbek alphabet). See also A. Usmanov. "Mukhakamat-al-Lugatajn" of Ališer Navoi on his defense of the Uzbek language and literature. Tashkent, 1948.
6. K.K. Judakhin. Materials on the problem of the sound system of Čagataj - Per. "Kul'tura i pis'mennost' Vostoka", Book 4. Baku, 1929, p. 67.
7. A.K. Borovkov. Ališer Navoi as founder of the Uzbek literary language. - Coll. "Ališer Navoi". Moscow, 1946, pp. 104, 105.
8. Ibid., pp. 106, 107.
9. K.K. Judakhin. Materials on the problem of the sound system of Čagataj, p. 67.
10. A.K. Borovkov. Ibid., p. 107.
11. V.V. Bartol'd. Mir-Ali-Šir and political life. - Coll. "Mir-Ali-Šir". Leningrad, 1928, p. 106.
12. See V.V. Rešetov. The Margelan sub-dialect of Uzbek. - "Izvestija UzFAN SSSR", No. 3. Tashkent, 1941; the same author - Some remarks on the consonant system and morphology of the Margelan sub-dialect of Uzbek. - "Izvestija UzFAN SSSR", No. 4, Tashkent, 1941.
13. Compare Desmaisons edition, v. 1, p. 37; v. 2, p. 36. Translation by G.S. Sablukov, p. 33.
14. Some of the popular Uzbek sub-dialects, for example, the Karabulak dialect, still have this form of the resultative case: tagdın, attın,

tepədin, ittin from taġ 'mountain', at 'horse' tepə 'hill', it 'dog'. (See K.K. Judakhin. Some peculiarities of the Karabulak sub-dialect. - Coll. "Ŭzbek dialektologijasidan materiallar', Part 1, Toškent, 1957, p. 35). There is some basis for thinking that in the not-too-distant past this form was the spoken form in the Tashkent sub-dialect.

15. V.V. Rešetov. On one Uzbek case. - "Tjurkologičeskij sbornik", v. 1 Moscow-Leningrad, 1951, pp. 176-183.
16. A.S. Ferdaus. The category of voice in Uzbek. Avtoreferat, Tashkent, 1953, p. 6.
17. V.V. Rešetov. On the category of the present tense in Uzbek. - "DAN UzSSR", No. 5, Tashkent, 1948.
18. See A.K. Borovkov. The Uzbek literary language during the period from 1905 to 1917. Tashkent, 1940.
19. E.D. Polivanov. Examples of non-harmonic (iranianized) sub-dialects of Uzbek. The vowel system of the sub-dialect of Samarkand. - "DAN SSSR", series B, No. 14, 1928, p. 306.
20. E.D. Polivanov. Uzbek dialectology and the Uzbek literary language. Tashkent, 1933; same author: Materials on the grammar of Uzbek, Part 1, Introduction, Tashkent, 1935.
21. Compare N.A. Baskakov. On the problem of classifying Turkic languages. - "Izvestija AN SSSR, OLJa", V. 11, issue 2, 1952, pp. 128-130.
22. The word "sart" has an ancient derivation. It is found in the eleventh century written document - "Kutadgu-bilik", and later, in the thirteenth century, in Rašid-ad-din (Compare: "It is not entirely without interest to note that in the Mongolian chronicles the term tazik [modern Tadjik - V. R.] is not found; corresponding to it is the term sartaul - sartagul [sart], in which fact we can find proof that in the thirteenth century these two terms had the same ethnic significance". Rašid-ad-din. Collection of chronicles, v. 1, bk. 2, Moscow, 1952, p. 67. footnote 1), in Plano Karpini, in the poem by Mukhammad Salikha "Šejbani-name". Babur refers to the population of Margelan in his time as "eli sart" (بابر نامه "Baber-name"). Publish. N.I. Il'minskij, Kazan', 1857, p. 4). During the time of Babur the term "sart" meant the valley Tadjik population (see "Baber-name", p. 4; V. Bartol'd. History of the cultural life of Turkestan. Leningrad, 1927, p. 80.) Before the revolution this term was the subject of heated discussion but its etymology and origin remained inadequately defined. In our time M.S. Andreev, regarding

Uzbek-Tadjik linguistic ties, contends that "the process of assimilation of the Tadjiks by Turkic elements" created "over an enormous region, from Fergana to Khorezm, a people, set apart by their language, called the sarts" (see M.S. Andreev. On the contemporary Tadjik language. - Coll. "Materials on the history of the Tadjiks and of Tadhikistan", V. 1, Stalinabad, 1945, p. 67). The student of the culture of the Uzbek population of Fergana, V.P. Nalivkin, states categorically that the "sedentary population of Fergana, who have the general name of sarts, consist of Uzbeks (or Turks) and Tadjiks". (V.P. Nalivkin and M. Nalivkina. Essay on the life of women among the sedentary foreign population of Fergana. Kazan', 1886, p. 15). The question of the "sarts" requires thorough investigation (see V.V. Rešetov. Some problems in Uzbek dialectology. - Coll. "Problems in the study of the languages of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan in the light of I.V. Stalin's studies on language", Tashkent, 1952, pp. 105-108).

23. In this regard the frequency lists of Arabic and Tadjik words in the Uzbek periodical press are not without interest. (see V.V. Rešetov. Lexical structure of the modern Uzbek press. - Coll. "Problems of language", issue 1, Tashkent, 1934, p. 44; A.K. Borovkov. Changes in the Uzbek lexicon and the new alphabet based on Russian writing. - "Izvestija UzFAN SSSR", No. 7, Tashkent, 1940, p. 22; M. Mirzaev. Soviet-international words in the Uzbek periodical press (1945-1950). Avtoreferat. Tashkent, 1951, p. 5).

24. A.M. Ščerbak. On the history of the formation of the Uzbek national language. - "Voprosy jazykoznanija", No. 6, 1954, pp. 107, 108.

25. See V.V. Rešetov. On the dialect base of the Uzbek literary language. - "Voprosy jazykoznanija", No. 1, 1955, pp. 100-108.

26. See E.D. Polivanov. Uzbek dialectology and the Uzbek literary language, pp. 9, 21; A.K. Borovkov. Description of the Uzbek "Umlaut" or "Uighuricized" sub-dialects. - Coll. "Belek" S.E. Malovu. Frunze, 1946, pp. 29, 30; V.V. Rešetov. On the Namangan sub-dialect of Uzbek. - "Collection of the academician V.A. Gordlevskij", Moscow, 1953, p. 218; A. Ju. Aliev. Uzbek tili ujči ševasining fonetik khususijatlari. - "Scholarly notes of the Namangan pedagogical institute", issue 3. Namangan, 1957, pp. 131-166.

27. See V.V. Rešetov. On one Uzbek case.

28. See V.V. Rešetov. On the category of the present tense in Uzbek.

29. S.A. Afzalov. The Parkent sub-dialect. Doctoral Dissertation. Tashkent, 1953.